SUBJECT No. 16.

Modification of Section (7) of the Village Offices Regulation.

Mr. Hutchviregowda, Gubbi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Rule 7 of the Village Offices Regulation is likely to act harshly, as represented in Subject No. 13 of 1909, upon the interests of patels and shanbhogs, as it empowers the Deputy Commissioner to deprive them of their hereditary right for misconduct. This rule may be so amended as to admit of appeals being preferred to the Revenue Commissioner or Councillors against the order of the Deputy Commissioner.

Reply of Government.—The existing provision is enough, more especially as under it there is scope for revision.

SUBJECT No. 17.

Amendment of Rule 3 of Order XXXII of the new Code of Civil Procedure.

Mr. M. Lakshminarasimhachar, Hassan taluk; Mr. C. Krishnamurti, Bangalore City Municipality and Mr. Venkatasamaiya, Nanjangud taluk.

Summary of discussion.—When a suit is instituted against a minor, a guardian is appointed to conduct the suit for such minor on an application of the plaintiff who supports his application by affidavit under para (3) Rule 3 of Order XXXII of the new Code of Civil Procedure (Regulation III of 1911); but by para (4) of the same rule and order it is directed that no order (appointing a guardian) shall be made on any application under the rule except upon notice to the minor and his guardian. This direction seems to be inconvenient when the minor is only an infant not capable of receiving the notice or understanding its contents, even when explained to him. The issue of such notice to the said minor defendant is to burden him with costs, but to no effect. It is therefore prayed that the rule may be amended to the effect that such notice to a minor may be issued when he is only above eight years of age at least and that no notice be issued to him otherwise.

Reply of Government.—The matter may be placed before the Rule Committee for consideration.

SUBJECT No. 18.

Amendment of the Civil Procedure Code.

Messrs. U. Shiva Rao and Manjiah, Chikmagalur Municipality; C. Subba Rao, Shimoga Municipality; and M. C. Rangiengar, Mysore City Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Rule 89 *re* application to set aside sale on deposit, of Order XXI of the Civil Procedure Code may be amended to enable an innocent person, who had acquired an interest in good faith before the sale in some of the properties sold, to apply for the setting aside of the sale of those particular lots of property on payment of the prescribed percentage and purchase money of those lots only.

The corresponding Section 310 A of the old Civil Procedure Code may be enacted, or the amendment, as prayed for, made.

Per contra.

Mr. Rangiengar stated that the matter was considered by the Select Committee in the Code of Civil Procedure Bill of which he was a member and as a result